(3) The State may provide advances of allowance only to small communities, as defined by the State, which would otherwise be unable to complete an application for a grant under § 35.2040 in the judgment of the State.

(4) The advance shall not exceed the Federal share of the estimate of the allowance for such costs which a grantee would receive under paragraph (a) of this section.

(5) In the event a Step 2+3, Step 3 or Step 7 grant is not awarded to a recipient of an advance, the State may seek repayment of the advance on such terms and conditions as it may determine. When the State recovers such advances they shall be added to its most recent grant for advances of allowance.

[49 FR 6234, Feb. 17, 1984, as amended at 55 FR 27095, June 29, 1990]

§ 35.2030 Facilities planning.

(a) *General.* (1) Facilities planning consists of those necessary plans and studies which directly relate to treatment works needed to comply with enforceable requirements of the Act. Facilities planning will investigate the need for proposed facilities. Through a systematic evaluation of alternatives that are feasible in light of the unique demographic, topographic, hydrologic and institutional characteristics of the area, it will demonstrate that, except for innovative and alternative technology under § 35.2032, the selected alternative is cost effective (i.e., is the most economical means of meeting the applicable effluent, water quality and public health requirements over the design life of the facility while recognizing environmental and other non-monetary considerations). For sewered communities with a population of 10,000 or less, consideration must be given to appropriate low cost technologies such as facultative ponds, trickling filters, oxidation ditches, or overland-flow land treatment; and for unsewered portions of communities of 10,000 or less, consideration must be given to onsite systems. The facilities plan will also demonstrate that the selected alternative is implementable from legal, institutional, financial and management standpoints.

(2) Grant assistance may be awarded before certification of the completed facilities plan if:

(i) The Regional Administrator determines that applicable statutory and regulatory requirements (including part 6) have been met; that the facilities planning related to the project has been substantially completed; and that the project for which grant assistance is awarded will not be significantly affected by the completion of the facilities plan and will be a component part of the complete waste treatment system; and

(ii) The applicant agrees to complete the facilities plan on a schedule the State accepts and such schedule is inserted as a special condition of the grant agreement.

(b) *Facilities plan contents.* A completed facilities plan must include:

(1) A description of both the proposed treatment works, and the complete waste treatment system of which it is a part.

(2) A description of the Best Practicable Wastewater Treatment Technology. (See § 35.2005(b)(7).)

(3) A cost-effectiveness analysis of the feasible conventional, innovative and alternative wastewater treatment works, processes and techniques capable of meeting the applicable effluent, water quality and public health requirements over the design life of the facility while recognizing environmental and other non-monetary considerations. The planning period for the cost-effectiveness analysis shall be 20 years. The monetary costs to be considered must include the present worth or equivalent annual value of all capital costs and operation and maintenance costs. The discount rate established by EPA for the construction grants program shall be used in the cost-effectiveness analysis. The population forecasting in the analysis shall be consistent with the current Needs Survey. A cost-effectiveness analysis must include:

(i) An evaluation of alternative flow reduction methods. (If the grant applicant demonstrates that the existing average daily base flow (ADBF) from the area is less than 70 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), or if the Regional Administrator determines the area has

an effective existing flow reduction program, additional flow reduction evaluation is not required.)

(ii) A description of the relationship between the capacity of alternatives and the needs to be served, including capacity for future growth expected after the treatment works become operational. This includes letters of intent from significant industrial users and all industries intending to increase their flows or relocate in the area documenting capacity needs and characteristics for existing or projected flows;

(iii) An evaluation of improved effluent quality attainable by upgrading the operation and maintenance and efficiency of existing facilities as an alternative or supplement to construction of new facilities;

(iv) An evaluation of the alternative methods for the reuse or ultimate disposal of treated wastewater and sludge material resulting from the treatment process;

(v) A consideration of systems with revenue generating applications;

(vi) An evaluation of opportunities to reduce use of, or recover energy;

(vii) Cost information on total capital costs, and annual operation and maintenance costs, as well as estimated annual or monthly costs to residential and industrial users.

(4) A demonstration of the non-existence or possible existence of excessive inflitration/inflow in the sewer system. See §35.2120.

(5) An analysis of the potential open space and recreation opportunities associated with the project.

(6) An adequate evaluation of the environmental impacts of alternatives under part 6 of this chapter.

(7) An evaluation of the water supply implications of the project.

(8) For the selected alternative, a concise description at an appropriate level of detail, of at least the following:

(i) Relevant design parameters;

(ii) Estimated capital construction and operation and maintenance costs, (identifying the Federal, State and local shares), and a description of the manner in which local costs will be financed;

(iii) Estimated cost of future expansion and long-term needs for reconstruction of facilities following their design life;

(iv) Cost impacts on wastewater system users; and

(v) Institutional and management arrangements necessary for successful implementation.

(c) *Submission and review of facilities plan.* Each facilities plan must be submitted to the State for review. EPA recommends that potential grant applicants confer with State reviewers early in the facilities planning process. In addition, a potential grant applicant may request in writing from the State and EPA an early determination under part 6 of this chapter of the appropriateness of a categorical exclusion from NEPA requirements, the scope of the environmental information document or the early preparation of an environmental impact statement.

§35.2032 Innovative and alternative technologies.

(a) *Funding for innovative and alternative technologies.* Projects or portions of projects using unit processes or techniques which the Regional Administrator determines to be innovative or alternative technology shall receive increased grants under §35.2152.

(1) Only funds from the reserve in §35.2020(c) shall be used to increase these grants.

(2) If the project is an alternative to conventional treatment works for a small community, funds from the reserve in §35.2020(b) may be used for the 75 percent portion, or any lower Federal share of the grant as determined under §35.2152.

(b) *Cost-effectiveness preference.* The Regional Administrator may award grant assistance for a treatment works or portion of a treatment works using innovative or alternative technologies if the total present worth cost of the treatment works for which the grant is to be made does not exceed the total present worth cost of the most cost-effective alternative by more than 15 percent.

(1) Privately-owned individual systems (§35.2034) are not eligible for this preference.

(2) If the present worth costs of the innovative or alternative unit processes are 50 percent or less of the